

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

“That the Mysore Appropriation (No. 2) Bill, 1954, be passed.”

The motion was adopted.

MYSORE APPROPRIATION (No. 3) BILL, 1954.

Motion to consider.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—Sir, I move :

“That the Mysore Appropriation (No. 3) Bill, 1954, be taken into consideration.”

Sir, this relates to the Supplementary Demands for the year 1953-54, which were passed by the House yesterday. I did not have sufficient time yesterday to reply to all the points that were raised during the discussion. I therefore propose to do so now.

It was said that we were being less than just and fair to this House by bringing forth these supplementary demands. This is far from the truth. It was our great anxiety to obtain the approval of the House to the various measures and schemes that have been adopted by Government that prompted us to move these Supplementary Demands. The Leader of the Opposition stated that these Supplementary Demands could have as well been brought up in the January Session. The Supplementary Demands moved then mainly related to the Bellary District. I will also give facts and figures to show that in the case of most of the schemes for which Supplementary Demands were passed yesterday, sanctions were accorded only after the last Supplementary Demands were passed by the House in the January Session. In some of the cases there was a doubt about the exact interpretation of the term “New Service” which could only be settled by correspondence with the Accountant General. For example, Sri S. Srinivasa Iyengar said that the

increase in the additional establishment like the appointment of the Special Chief Engineer and other staff connected with the Bhadra Reservoir would not come under the definition of “New Service.” But the Accountant General advised us otherwise and he wrote to us accordingly on 11th January 1954. The Supplementary Demands to be moved in the January Session had been printed on 10th January 1954, and I could not therefore include it in the Demands moved on 19th January 1954.

DEMAND No. 9—19. I.N.E.D.

(a) *Constructing an anicut across Doddanakatte halla, Krishnarajpet.*

The construction of an anicut across Doddanakatte halla now proposed is in pursuance of the longstanding representation from the ryots of the village shifted from the Krishnaraja Sagar submersion area. It is estimated to cost Rs. 3.75 lakhs and will irrigate about 600 acres of land. The project is remunerative, as it is expected to yield about 3.8 per cent return on the Government share of the cost. The demand could not be placed before the Legislature earlier as the formalities under the Irrigation Act were completed only recently and final reports were received this month (26th March 1954).

DEMAND No. 9—19. I.N.E.D.

(b) *Increasing capacity of Sulebele tank, Hoskote Taluk.*

This is a work costing about Rs. 1.08 lakhs and expected to irrigate about 432 acres. The need for this work was being urged for a long time but the proposal did not reach a final stage until recently. The Chief Engineer proposed in March 1954 that in order to take advantage of the working season and in view of the urgency, the work may be started immediately. Hence a Demand could not be placed before the January Session of the Assembly.

DEMAND No. 9—19. I.N.E.D.

(c) *Restoring Nagarbhavi tank,
Goribidnur Taluk.*

The proposal in this case is to re-construct an old tank at a cost of Rs. 1.58 lakhs so as to irrigate 170 acres. Since the tank is situated in the zone covered by the Madras-Mysore Agreement, there were long-drawn out negotiations, first with the Madras Government and later with the Government of Andhra. It is only in February 1954 that these were finalised and the Government of Andhra were finally intimated on 5th February 1954 about the decision of this Government to take up the project. The proposal to start the work was also approved since then in order to conserve the State's rights *re*: the utilisation of water in that valley. The demand could not therefore be placed before the Legislature earlier.

DEMAND No. 18,

Sri A. G. Ramachandra Rao has explained yesterday how the need arose to move for a Supplementary Demand under this Head. The Scheme has been prepared by the Planning Commission under which employment is to be afforded to 550 S.S.L.C. qualified candidates. Two hundred New Primary Schools and 50 Social Education Centres have to be opened in rural areas. Three hundred persons will be employed as additional teachers in the existing single-teacher schools. The scheme will cost Rs. 2,09,000 per year of which the share of the Central Government is Rs. 1,77,000. The Central Government will give assistance for a period of three years. This scheme has finally been approved on 4th January 1954. Whether this was a 'New Service' or not had to be decided in consultation with the Accountant General who advised us finally on 23rd March 1954 that it was considered to be 'New Service'. I have therefore immediately moved the Legislature for obtaining their approval for a Supplementary Demand.

L.A.

DEMAND No. 23.

As the Hon'ble Members are aware, while presenting the Budget for 54-55 on 6th March 1954, I announced the intention of Government to create a Depressed Classes Amelioration Fund. This was intended to be done to prevent any lapses of the funds voted by the Legislature for the amelioration of the Depressed Classes. I need hardly emphasise the great need for sustained efforts on the part of all of us to improve their conditions, and I am confident that the constitution of the Fund is a step in the right direction. The creation of the Fund no doubt gives satisfaction to all the Harijan members. But it is wrong to suggest that was done to placate them. The Fund was constituted because it was considered the right thing to do.

The Government of India communicated their concurrence to the schemes for the welfare of ex-criminal tribes on the 10th December 1953. Administrative approval to the scheme was given on 11th February 1954. The details of the works to be done have been indicated in the explanatory note. Some progress has been achieved in all these schemes, and I may assure the House that no efforts will be spared to see that the moneys allotted are usefully and quickly spent.

DEMAND No. 26—43. INDUSTRIES AND SUPPLIES.

(a) *Industries—Government Electric
Factory.*

In July 1950, the Management and the Labour Association of the Government Electric Factory entered into an agreement regarding wages and other service conditions. The Labour Association subsequently contended that the Management had not implemented some of the provisions of the agreement and the disputes arising therefrom were accordingly referred by Government to the Labour Tribunal. The Tribunal passed an award in September 1953. Both the Management and the Labour Association went in appeal against the award as they were not satisfied with the findings of

(Sri K. HANUMANTHAIA.)

the award in respect of certain issues. The Labour Appellate Tribunal at Lucknow in their interim order dated the 13th February 1954 directed that Government shall pay to the employees of the Government Electric Factory wages at the rates awarded by the State Tribunal for the years 1951 and 1952 within one month from the date of their order, and also directed that, in case payment was not made as directed, Government would be liable to pay increased wages at the award rates for another year, i.e., 1953 as well. In order to enable the parties to arrive at a settlement, the Tribunal also granted two months' time for the purpose. They further directed that if the payment is not made and a settlement not arrived at within the time allowed, the Government will not be entitled to press their appeal without making payments for the years 1951, 1952 and 1953 at the award rates.

In view of the above orders of the Appellate Tribunal, negotiations with the Government Electric Factory Labour Association were instituted, as a result of which the Management of the Factory and the Labour Association arrived at an agreement on the 15th March 1954 under which the Association agreed, among other things, not to claim increments for 1953 provided payment at award rates for 1951 and 1952 was made immediately.

Government approved this agreement and directed that immediate action be taken to implement its terms, and to complete the payment within the 20th March 1954. This order is dated the 16th March 1954.

The extra expenditure involved in this connection (i.e., for payment of arrears of wages at award rates for 1951 and 1952) is approximately Rs. 3,84,000 and this was ordered to be met by re-appropriation of sanctioned grants under "43. Industries and Supplies—(a) Industries—3-A Working Expenses of Government Industrial and Commercial Undertakings—(vi) Electric Factory." As the expenditure was regarded as a "New Service," the amount was advanced from the Contingency Fund

in the first instance, and was to be recouped by obtaining a token vote of the Legislature. A token grant of Rs. 100 for this purpose has accordingly been included in the supplementary demand for 1953-54.

The demand could not be placed earlier as the order of the Appellate Labour Tribunal directing the payment was made only on the 13th February 1954 and negotiations with the Labour Association were completed only on the 15th March 1954.

DEMAND No. 29—"50. CIVIL WORKS"—ITEM No. 1.

(a) *Construction of overhead reservoir to the Combined Hospital, Bangalore.*

This work is estimated to cost about Rs. 1.5 lakhs and has been proposed in view of the repeated requests of the Medical Department to provide assured water supply in the Victoria Hospital area. The combined hospital, as you are aware, Sir, is Victoria Hospital, Maternity Hospital and Children's Hospital and Dispensaries situated within that area. Administrative sanction to this work was accorded on 5th January 1954. Hence the demand could not be placed before the Legislature earlier. This demand has been brought forward as it was proposed to start work this month.

DEMAND No. 29—"50. CIVIL WORKS"—ITEM No. 2.

(b) *Constructing the 4th Block of New Mental Hospital, Bangalore.*

The Director of Medical Services has been repeatedly urging that additional accommodation for the Hospital was very necessary. In view of the need to improve accommodation it was proposed to start construction immediately. The formalities including those connected with the calling for tenders were finalised on 2nd February 1954 and the work was started during the same month. An outlay of nearly Rs. 8,000 is expected to be incurred by the end

of this month. Hence the need for this demand.

DEMAND No. 29—"50. CIVIL WORKS"—ITEM No. 3.

Metalling M. C. Road from Nallurpala to Markal Gate.

This is a forest road in Mysore territory which is useful for transport of timber. The Coorg Government were urging that this road should be repaired and offered to pay half the cost. The estimated cost is Rs. 1,78,000 and an advance of Rs. 50,000 has been received from the Coorg Government towards their contribution. Work was started recently in view of the urgency pleaded by the Coorg Government and a sum of over Rs. 30,000 has already been spent on the work. A demand in this behalf could not be placed earlier as proposal to start the work did not arise when the earlier supplementary demands were framed.

DEMAND No. 29—"50. CIVIL WORKS"—ITEM No. 4.

Cement concreting of B. H. Road (a) from 2/65 to 8/71 between Dodguni and Tiptur and (b) from 1/89 to 5/96 between Tiptur and Arsikere.

The work of cement concreting the above lengths of roads was started recently in view of the urgent need to improve the condition of the road. A total outlay of over Rs. 40,000 has already been incurred. The demand could not be placed before the Legislature earlier as the concerned estimates were not sanctioned.

DEMAND No. 34.

I received a letter on 15th October 1953 from Srimathi Indira Gandhi appealing for aid to our soldiers who were in Korea. She said in her appeal, "In particular we should like them to celebrate Deepavali appropriately even though they are far from their homeland. Our young men in Korea are facing great difficulties and have distinguished themselves by their

calm and disciplined behaviour." Government felt that it was a worthy cause, and a decision was taken to contribute a sum of Rs. 2,000 for being utilised for the comforts of the Indian soldiers in Korea. It would be my duty at this juncture to say how deeply we all appreciate the great mission of Peace which our soldiers performed with such distinction in Korea. I would also like to pay my tribute to the magnificent way in which Lieut.-General Thimmayya distinguished himself as Chairman of the N.N.R.C.

The Accountant General advised us on 30th January 1954 to obtain a Supplementary Grant. We have come before the Legislature immediately and I am sure that this House will approve of the small contribution that we have given for a worthy cause.

DEMAND No. 40—68. I.N.E.D.

(1) Pay of staff of Special Chief Engineer and of Divisions.

Government accorded sanction to the additional staff in connection with the execution of major irrigation works in November 1953. Though the additional cost was over a lakh of rupees, this was not in the first instance treated as a new service as the proposal was only to sanction additional staff and the approval of the Legislature was obtained in January 1954 only to the supplementary grants for the major irrigation projects as a whole.

On 11th January 1954, the Accountant General suggested that the additional staff should itself be treated as a new service and in pursuance of that suggestion, this demand has been brought forward.

(2) Construction of a tank at Sonnaikanahally.

In the light of the opinion of the Standing Technical Advisory Committee constituted by Government, it was decided to defer for some time the consideration of the Mangala Project in Kunigal Taluk, though it was included in the Five-Year Plan. In its

(SRI K. HANUMANTHAIYA.)

place, it was proposed to take up during the first Five-Year Plan period the Sonnaikanahalli Project costing Rs. 8.94 lakhs and expected to irrigate about 1,000 acres. Though administrative sanction was accorded to this project in October 1953, work could not be commenced until the concurrence of the Planning Commission was obtained for the substitution. This was got only on 8th February 1954. The demand could not therefore be placed before the Legislature earlier. The people of the locality have urged the commencement of the Project for several years past and have even agreed to pay a portion of the contribution in advance. Approval has been accorded to taking up the preliminary works after receipt of the Planning Commission's concurrence.

DEMAND No. 41.

Spun Cast Iron Pipe Plant—Iron and Steel Works, Bhadravati.

This is one of the development schemes proposed to be taken up by the Mysore Iron and Steel Works for the manufacture of cast iron pipes 3" to 12" diameter and is intended to meet the large demand from the Public Works Department, various municipalities and the public, in regard to pipes for water supply and also drainage schemes and other similar purposes. It is a valuable means of utilising the surplus pig iron in the Works. The Scheme is estimated to cost Rs. 45 lakhs and is expected to yield a return of 14 per cent. The question of taking up this scheme with loan assistance from the Central Government has been under correspondence with them for over 3 years. The Government of India after satisfying themselves about the utility of this scheme have approved of it and promised to grant the necessary loan assistance. In August 1953 the Government of Mysore applied to the Central Government for loan assistance to the extent of Rs. 12.5 lakhs for expenditure on the scheme during the

year 1953-54. In their letter dated the 23rd September 1953 the Government of India communicated their sanction to a total loan assistance of Rs. 45.48 lakhs for the development schemes of the Mysore Iron and Steel Works including a provision of Rs. 12.5 lakhs for the Spun Cast Iron Pipes Plant for expenditure during the current year. This was followed by another letter from the Government of India, dated the 10th October 1953 asking the Works to proceed with the scheme expeditiously. All the development schemes of the Mysore Iron and Steel Works are now being financed with Central assistance and had we anticipated that Central assistance would be forthcoming for this scheme during the current year alone, due provision would have been made in the Budget estimates for 1953-54; but as already explained above the Government of India's approval was received only in September 1953 after which it was necessary for the Works to call for quotations and finalise the estimates. Administrative sanction for the Scheme was applied for by the Works on 22nd December 1953 and sanction by Government was accorded in the same month. The question of providing necessary funds in the State Budget by a supplementary grant during the current year was then taken up. The Finance Department, however, wanted to verify whether the scheme would actually be implemented during the current year and if so what the actual expenditure likely to be incurred during the current year would be. The data required by them was furnished by the Works in March 1954 and according to their report the actual expenditure likely to be incurred during the current year was 9.5 lakhs as against Rs. 12.5 lakhs. The amount to be made up was available by re-appropriation of savings in the Works grants. As this is a new Development Scheme for which provision had not been made in the Budget for 1953-54, the Finance Department considered that this should be regarded as a 'New Service' and accordingly provided for token grant of Rs. 100 being obtained with the sanction of the Legislature to

regularise the expenditure. It would be clear therefore that the demand could not be placed earlier as the question of providing for it arose only in September and Government wanted to satisfy themselves that the amount was likely to be spent during the current year before providing for it in the Budget.

DEMAND No. 42—81-A. CAPITAL ACCOUNT OF ELECTRICITY SCHEMES.

Running power lines to Channagiri from master unit sub-station, Chitaldrug, and changing over the present supply from Lingadahalli, etc.

Though administrative sanction to the estimate of Rs. 1,18,000 was accorded on 28th April 1953, it was found not possible to take up the work owing to want of materials. Until last month, the need for taking up the work was not also very keenly felt. Owing to materials having become available and the immediate need for starting the work in order to improve the capacity of the lines for purposes of feeding several sanctioned I. P. sets in Channagiri Taluk work was proposed to be started last month. Hence the demand could not be placed earlier. The outlay anticipated during the year is proposed to be met by re-appropriation from sanctioned grants.

Sir, I have given reasons in detail and also the dates to show that these demands could not be placed before the House earlier. Sir, we are working under the Constitution. Therefore several new problems arise. Several interpretations of the same article, of the same rule, arise. Therefore it naturally takes a little correspondence between the Accountant General and the Government. Ultimately either the Accountant General accepts our view or we have got to accept his views. Therefore a little delay does take place in the matter of finalising the nomenclature of these demands. Therefore, Sir, you will kindly see that the Government has not been less just to itself or to the House in bringing

forward these demands for the approval of the Legislature.

I am particularly sorry for the remarks flung on the departmental heads. As I know they are working overtime. They are working very hard. They are working very sincerely. To make uncalled for remarks against them is not just. I hope the House will not countenance any such attacks. On the other hand, as a responsible Minister of this House, I have no hesitation in paying a handsome tribute to the officials of the Finance Department for their hard and sustained and overtime work.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Motion moved :

“That the Mysore Appropriation (No. 3) Bill, 1954, be taken into consideration.”

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM (Jagalur).—Should we sit till 5-30, Sir?

Mr. SPEAKER.—No. Five.

(Sri S. GOPALA GOWDA rose.)

Mr. SPEAKER.—All right. You go on. Do not exceed 15 minutes so that another member may have a chance.

*ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ (ಸಾಗರ-ಹೊಸ ನಗರ).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಈಗ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಮಂಡಿಸಲ್ಪಟ್ಟಿರುವ ಅಪ್ರೋಪ್ರಿಯೇಷನ್ ಬಿಲ್ ನಂ. 3, 1954—ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಒಂದೆರಡು ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಆರ್ಥಿಕ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಈಗತಾನೇ ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಒಂದು ಉದ್ದವಾದ ಹೇಳಿಕೆಯನ್ನು ಸಭೆಯಮುಂದೆ ಇಟ್ಟರು. ಇದನ್ನು ನಿನ್ನೆ Estimate Committee ಮುಂದೆ ಇಡಬೇಕೆಂಬುದು ಅವರಿಗೇಕೆ ಹೊಳೆಯಲಿಲ್ಲವೋ ಗೊತ್ತಾಗಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಅವರು ಇದನ್ನು ಮಂಡಿಸುವಾಗ ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದುದು ಅವರ ಕರ್ತವ್ಯವಾಗಿತ್ತು ಎಂದು ನಾನು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದರೆ ನಿನ್ನೆ ಏನು ಅನುಮಾನದಿಂದ ಟೀಕೆ ಬಂದಿತೋ ಅದು ಬರುತ್ತಿರಲಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ತಿಳಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಈ ವರ್ಷದ ಆಯವ್ಯಯವನ್ನು ಇಲ್ಲಿಯ ವರೆಗೆ ಈ ಸಭೆ ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡಿದೆ. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಆರ್ಥಿಕ ಸಚಿವರು ಸಹ ಈ ಆಯವ್ಯಯವನ್ನು ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಇದ್ದತ್ತಾ ಬಹಳ ವಿಶದವಾಗಿ ಅನೇಕ ವಿಚಾರಗಳನ್ನು ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪಿಸಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಆ ಭಾಷಣವನ್ನು ನಾವು ನೋಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ ಮತ್ತು ಓದಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಮತ್ತು ಪ್ರತಿ ದಿನ ಡಿಮಾಂಡ್‌ಗಳ ಮೇಲೆ ಅನೇಕರು ಅವಕಾಶ ದೊರೆತಾಗ ತಮ್ಮ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ತಿಳಿಸಿ ಸಲಹೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ನಾನೂ ಸಹ ಈ ಭಾಷಣವನ್ನು ಓದಿ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾದ ಮಟ್ಟಿಗೂ ಅರ್ಥಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನ ಪಟ್ಟಿರುತ್ತೇನೆ, ಸರಾರದವರು ಅನುಸರಿಸುವ ಕಾರ್ಯನೀತಿಯೇನು, ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮವೇನು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಸರ್ವಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಈ ಬಡ ಚ ಮಂಡಿಸುವಾಗ

(ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ.)

ನೂಟಿಸುವುದು ನೂತನವೆಂಬ ಒಂದು ಮಾತು ಈ ಭಾಷಣದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಡಕವಾಗಿದೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—This Bill relates to the additional and supplementary grants. The Hon'ble Member will have to confine himself to the demands specified in the Bill itself. Nothing more.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ.—ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಹಾಗೆ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ ಎಂದು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಹಾಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದ ಇರುವ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪಿಸುತ್ತಾ ಕಾಲಕಳೆಯುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ನಾನು ತಯಾರಾಗಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಆಯವ್ಯಯವನ್ನು ಈ ವರ್ಷ ಮಂಡಿಸುವಾಗ ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಅಷ್ಟೇ ಕೊಡಿಸುತ್ತಾರೆ, ಚಾಲ್ತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನಾಮಳಿ ವಿಶೇಷವಾಗಿ ಘನವಾಗಿದೆಯೆಂದು ಮತ್ತು ಮಳೆ ಬಂದಿದೆಯೆಂದು. ಮಳೆ ಬಂದಿರುವುದು ನಿಜ. ಆದರೆ ಬೆಳೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿದೆ ಎಂಬ ಮಾತು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆಬೇಕಾದ ಅಂಶವೆನ್ನುತ್ತದೆ. ಈ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪಿಸಿರುವುದನ್ನು ಭಾಷಣದ 27ನೆಯ ಪುಟದಲ್ಲಿ ನೋಡಬಹುದು. ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನಾಮಳಿ ಕೆಲವುಕಡೆ ವಿಶೇಷ ಮಳೆಯಿಂದ ನಿರೀತವಾಗಿ ಕಾಮಗಾರಿಗೆ ಜುಂ ಆಗಿ, ಕೆರೆ ಒಡೆದು ಹೋಗಿರುವುದನ್ನು ಜೀರ್ಣೋದ್ಧಾರ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ದುರಸ್ತಿ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ 11.71 ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳ ವೆಚ್ಚವಾಗಬಹುದೆಂದು ಅಂದಾಜುಮಾಡಿದೆಯೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಎಷ್ಟು ಬೆಳೆ ನಷ್ಟವಾಗಿದೆ, ಬಾಸಗೇ ಜನರ ಜಮೀನ್ ಎಷ್ಟು ಕೆಟ್ಟುಹೋಯಿತು, ನಷ್ಟವೆಷ್ಟೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪಿಸಿಲ್ಲ, ಅದನ್ನು ಕೈಬಿಟ್ಟಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ.

ಮತ್ತೊಂದು ವಿಚಾರ, ಈಗಿನ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಪ್ರಜಾ ಸರ್ಕಾರ. ಈ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಆಡಳಿತ ಸೂತ್ರವನ್ನು ವಹಿಸಿಕೊಂಡಮೇಲೆ,—ಪ್ರತಿಗಾಮಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರವೆಂದರೆ ರಾಜಮಹಾರಾಜರ ಸರ್ಕಾರ, ಪಾಳೆಯಗಾರ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ತಪ್ಪಿದಮೇಲೆ—ಜನತೆಯ ಮುಖಂಡರು ಎಷ್ಟುಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ತಾವು ಕೊಟ್ಟ ಆಶ್ವಾಸವನ್ನು ಈಡೇರಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ? ಈ ಅನಾರವನ್ನು ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಶ್ರೀ ಭೀಮಪ್ಪನಾಯಕರು, ಶ್ರೀ ಟಿ. ಮರಿಯಪ್ಪನವರು ಮತ್ತು ಶ್ರೀ ಪಟ್ಟಾಭಿರಾಮೇಶ್ವರರು ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೇನೂ ಉತ್ತರವಿಲ್ಲ. ನಾನು ಒಂದು ಬಾರಿ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯೊಂದಕ್ಕೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಕೇಳಿದಾಗ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಅಧಿಕ ಸಚಿವರು ಈಗಿನ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಆಡಳಿತ ಸಮರ್ಪಕವಾಗಿರುವೆಂದು ಯಾವ ಆಧಾರದ ಮೇಲೆ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೀರಿ ಎಂದು ಸವಾಲು ಹಾಕಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ.....

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—I do not know why this Hon'ble Member is going on making incorrect statements. I would like to see the proceedings to know as to when I have said like that.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಈ ರೀತಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಮನೋಭಾವವನ್ನು ತಳೆಯುವುದಾದರೆ ಅದರ ಪರಿಣಾಮ ದೇಶದ ಮೇಲೆ ಏನಾಗಬಹುದೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ಇವೊತ್ತ ಯೋಚಿಸಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಪ್ರಜಾಸತ್ತೆಯನ್ನು ಧೈರ್ಯವನ್ನು ಸಾಧಿಸಬೇಕಾದರೆ, ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವ ತತ್ವವನ್ನು ಬೆಳೆಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಬರಬೇಕಾದ

ಈ ಅಪ್ರೋಪ್ರಿಯೇಷನ್ ಬಿಲ್ ಮೂಲಕ 49 ಕೋಟಿ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳಷ್ಟು ವೆಚ್ಚಕ್ಕೆ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಅನುಮತಿ ಅವರು ಕೇಳುತ್ತಿರುವ ಈ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಇದರ ಮೂಲ ಎಲ್ಲಿದೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಗ್ರಹಿಸಬೇಕು.

Mr. SPEAKER.—That is why I said in one sentence that this Bill relates to the supplementary estimates. You are making some general remarks relating to the previous Appropriation Bill. But this Bill is quite different from that one. In the debate on this Bill you will have to confine yourself only to the grants mentioned therein and nothing else. But you are referring to the speeches made by Hon'ble Members relating to the previous Bill. That is irrelevant.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ.—ಈ ಗ್ರಾಂಟಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ವಿಚಾರ ನಾನು ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

4-30 P.M.

ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ನಾನು ಅರ್ಥ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವುದು ಹೇಗೆಂದರೆ: ಈ ವರ್ಷದ ಆಯವ್ಯಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವ ಯಾವ ಬಾಬುಗಳನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರಿಗೆ ಮೊದಲೇ ಸೇರಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅನಾನುಕೂಲವಾಯಿತೋ ಅವನ್ನು ಈಗ ಸೇರಿಸಬಹುದು ಎಂದು ಈ ಕಾನೂನಿನ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಆಧಾರ ಇತ್ತು; ಸೇರಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈ ವರ್ಷದ ಆಯವ್ಯಯದ ನಿಶ್ಚಯವನ್ನು ಚರ್ಚಿಸುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ಮತ್ತು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಮಾಡಿರುವುದಾದ ರೋಪದೋಷಗಳನ್ನು ಚರ್ಚಿಸುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ, ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಮಾಡುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ನನಗೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಇದೆ. ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲಿನ ವ್ಯಾಖ್ಯೆಯಿಂದ ಹೊರಗೆ ಹೋಗಿದ್ದೇನೆ ಎಂಬುದು ನನ್ನ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ಬರುತ್ತಾ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಅದು ಅರ್ಥವಾಗುತ್ತಾ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಅಧಿಕ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವ ಒಂದು ವಿವರಣೆಯನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟರೆ ಈ ಡಿಮಾಂಡ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದದ್ದು ಏನಿದೆ, ಸ್ವಾಮಿ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—That is why he made that statement. That is why that explanatory note was given.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ.—ಈಗತಾನೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರತಕ್ಕ ಆ ವಿವರಣೆಯನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಂಡು ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಡುವಂಥ ಸಾಮರ್ಥ್ಯ ನನಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಅಷ್ಟು ನಾನು ಯಂತ್ರವಲ್ಲ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—You have heard him with rapt attention. You have read the explanatory note. My only point is that you must confine yourself to the grants specified therein, not about the general policy.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ.—ನಾನು ಹೇಳುವುದು ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲಿನ ವ್ಯಾಖ್ಯೆಗೆ ಪೂರ್ಣ ಹೊರಗೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದಾದರೆ ನಾನು ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ತಯಾರಾಗಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I quite see your point. If this statement had been made yesterday when the Appropriation

Bill was moved, it would have been quite apt; I quite see the point. But perhaps the Hon'ble the Chief Minister thought that since the demands are to be met by re-appropriation and also by token demands as he had put forward, it was not necessary.

***Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.**—I may submit, Sir, that this is an Appropriation Bill and by this an amount of nearly 35 lakhs is sought to be appropriated. While opposing this Bill, the Member is at liberty to advance such reasons as he deems fit as to why the demands should be rejected and it is not necessary that he should strictly confine himself to the demands stated therein. His contention is that the passing of these demands will deteriorate the financial position, and it will have a serious effect on the people and on the raiyats. And as such, my humble submission is that it is the usual practice not only now but previously also that while discussing the Appropriation Bill or any Bill, the Members will generally have a wider scope to advance arguments and reasons; and he is not expected to restrict himself only to those demands. I submit that the Member should be given greater latitude to give wider reasons why this Bill should be opposed. He may also indicate the general trend of public opinion and also the general effect it will have on the public. As such, I submit that a member speaking on this Bill may be given a greater latitude; and of course the Minister also will have the liberty to traverse a wider field and make a suitable reply.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK (Molakalmuru).—I should like to tell my friend that it was not necessary at all for the Ministry to bring it before this House. They are quite at liberty and it is permissible to make use of the money from the consolidated fund for this purpose. And they need not give any more explanation than is printed in the Explanatory note. But still as Responsible Ministers they have brought it to the notice of the House and they have in brief stated the reasons for not bringing it earlier. After all it is a token grant that

is asked; and having approved that yesterday, to go on commenting like this serves no purpose. The Chief Minister has given explanation as to how these needs arose and he has satisfied the House and Mr. Gopala Gowda I think was satisfied with the explanation given earlier. And having admitted that, if he goes back upon his previous position and makes a speech, then there is no need for col. No. 2 of the Appropriation Bill. You could only say that these Demands could have been brought earlier. Instead of that, you take certain other matters extraneous into consideration and say this expenditure is not at all mentioned in this Bill. Whether the Bill relates to supplementary grants unforeseen or whether the Bill relates to new services, still you want to harp upon your old theme. The Hon'ble Speaker has given his ruling to make remarks as they pertain to the merits of the items mentioned in the Bill and still the Hon'ble Member persists in making his observations; it is nothing but violating and questioning the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The ruling was not questioned. That is why I did not think of any other course of action. I give an assurance to the Leader of the Opposition Party that it is my duty to see that considerable latitude is given to the Members while making comments. That does not mean that Members should make unfair comments or unnecessary or uncalled for comments. In support of my action, I can only quote the following: "The debate on Supplementary and Excess Grants is restricted to the principles contained in the estimates on which these grants are sought and to the application of the items which compose these grants and the debate cannot touch the policy or the expenditure sanctioned under the heads of Budget estimates on which original grant was obtained...before the committee by the items contained in the supplementary or excess estimates."

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—In addition, I may also point out that I feel surprised at the way the Leader of the Opposition explains the position. I thought, experienced parliamentarian

(SRI K. HANUMANTHAIYA.)

as he is, he knew the scope of discussion. Rule 146, Sir, says :

"The matter of every speech must be strictly relevant to the matter before the Assembly."

And again, Rule 148 says ;

"The Speaker, after having called the attention of the Assembly to the conduct of a member who persists in irrelevance or in tedious repetition either of his own arguments or of the arguments used by other members in debate, may direct him to discontinue his speech."

Speaking on every matter before the Assembly, and going on attacking and abusing the Government, is hardly a fair way parliamentary procedure. I am surprised that the Hon'ble Leader of the Opposition should uphold the point of view of party-men in the way he has done, Sir.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—We never abused; we never attacked. We only criticised.

*ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಹುಚ್ಚೇಗೌಡ (ತುರುವೇಕೆರೆ).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, 3 ನೆಯ ಸಂಬರಿನ ಅಪ್ರೋಪ್ರಿಯೇಷನ್ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ವಿರೋಧಿಸುತ್ತಾ ಒಂದೆಡೆ ಮಾತುಗಳನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿ ತ್ತೀನೆ. ಮೊದಲನೆಯದಾಗಿ ಇದರಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಡಿಮ್ಯಾಂಡುಗಳನ್ನು ಜನಪರಿ ತಿಂಗಳಲ್ಲೇ ತರಬಹುದಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಅನೇಕ ಖರ್ಚುಗಳು ನಡೆದಿವೆಯೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವಾಗ ಅದನ್ನು ಊಹಿಸಿ ಆಗಲೇ ತರಬಹುದಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಒಂದು ವೇಳೆ ಒಪ್ಪಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಈಗ ಖರ್ಚಾಗಿರುವ ಹಣಕ್ಕೆ ಬಡ್ಡೆಟ್ ಹೆಡ್ ಯಾವುದು, ಎಸ್ವಿಮೇಟ್ ಎಷ್ಟು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳದೆ ಬರೀ ಜೋರ್ಕೆ ಡಿಮ್ಯಾಂಡ್ ತಂದಿರುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ಅರ್ಥವೇನು ?

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—Token Demand because we do not incur any extra expenditure. It is merely a re-appropriation of the grants already made as Sri Srinivasa Iyengar so eloquently explained yesterday. You must be satisfied with his explanation.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಹುಚ್ಚೇಗೌಡ.—ಹೀಗೆ ಹೇಳುವುದು ಬಹಳ ವ್ಯಸನಕರ. ಪ್ರತಿ ಸಲ ಬಿಲ್ಲು ತಂದಾಗಲೂ ಏನಾದರೂ ನ್ಯೂನತೆಯಿದ್ದರೆ ಅದನ್ನು ವಿರೋಧಿಸಲೇಬೇಕು. ವಿರೋಧಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ವಿರೋಧ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. ಮೊದಲು ಹೀಗೆ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಪಕ್ಷದ ನಡವಳಿಕೆ ಈಗ ನಮ್ಮ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಕ್ಕನುಗುಣವಾಗಿ ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಯವರೆಗೆ ಮಾತನಾಡಿದವರೆಲ್ಲರೂ ಕೂಡ ಇದನ್ನು ವಿರೋಧಿಸಿ ಮಾತನಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ನಾವು ಎಚ್ಚರಿಕೆ

ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ಹಿಂದೆ ಖಂಡಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದವರು ಈಗ ತಾವೇ ಎಚ್ಚರಿಕೆ ಕೊಡಲು ಪ್ರಾರಂಭಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಭೀಮಪ್ಪ ನಾಯಕರು ಹೇಳಿದಂತೆ ನಾನು ಒಂದು ಕಥೆ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಒಬ್ಬ ಹೆಂಗಸು ಮಗನನ್ನು ಸಂತೆಗೆ ಕರೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಹೋದಾಗ ಆ ಮಗ ಬಾಳೆಹಣ್ಣು ಕದ್ದ. ಮನೆಗೆ ಹೋದ ಮೇಲೆ ಅದನ್ನು ತಾಯಿಗೆ ತೋರಿಸಲು ಆಕೆ ಸಂತೋಷ ಪಟ್ಟಳು. ಅದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದೆಂದು ಅವನು ತಿಳಿದು ಮುಂದೆ ದೊಡ್ಡ ಕಳ್ಳನಾದ. ಒಂದು ಸಲ ಮುಂದೆ ತಪ್ಪುಮಾಡಿದಾಗ ಅವನನ್ನು ಗಲ್ಲೆಗೆ ಹಾಕಬೇಕಾಯಿತು. ಆಗ ಆ ಮಗ ತನ್ನ ತಾಯಿಯನ್ನು ನೋಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೇಳಿದ. ತಾಯಿಯನ್ನು ನೋಡಲು ಕರೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಹೋದರು. ಆಗ ತಾಯಿಯು ಕಿವಿಹಿಡಿದು ಆಕೆಯ ಮೂಗನ್ನು ಕಟ್ಟಿದ. ಏಕೆ ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಕೇಳಿದರೆ, ಬಾಳೆಹಣ್ಣು ಕಳ್ಳತನಮಾಡಿದಾಗ ಸಂತೋಷ ಪಟ್ಟಿದ್ದರಿಂದ ತಾನೇ ನಾನು ಈ ದಿವಸ ದೊಡ್ಡ ಕಳ್ಳನಾಗಿ ಈ ಶಿಕ್ಷೆ ಅನುಭವಿಸಬೇಕಾಗಿ ಬಂದದ್ದು, ಆಗಲೇ ನನಗೆ ಶಿಕ್ಷೆಮಾಡಿ ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದು ತಪ್ಪು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದರೆ ಈ ದಿವಸ ನಾನು ಈ ಶಿಕ್ಷೆಗೆ ಗುರಿಯಾಗುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದನಂತೆ. ಹೀಗೆ ಹಿಂದೆ ಈ ರೀತಿ ಟೀಕೆ ಮಾಡಿದಾಗ, ಸರ್ಕಾರ ದಾರಿ ತಪ್ಪಿದಾಗ ಅದನ್ನು ಟೀಕೆ ಮಾಡಿದಾಗ ಬರೀ ವಿರೋಧಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ವಿರೋಧ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದರು. ಅದೇ ಈ ದಿವಸ ಹಾಗೆ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದವರೇ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ದಾರಿ ತಪ್ಪಿ ಹೋಗಿ ದೆಯೆಂದು ನಮ್ಮ ಜೊತೆಯಲ್ಲ ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಂದೆ ಬರುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ಡಿಮ್ಯಾಂಡಿಗೆ ಅವಶ್ಯಕತೆಯಿತ್ತೆ, ಇಲ್ಲವೆ ಎಂದು ನೋಡಿಲ್ಲ. ಬ್ಯಾಡ್ ಬಡ್ಡೆಟ್ ನಿಂದ ಇದೆಲ್ಲಾ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಬಡ್ಡೆಟ್ಟನ್ನು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದರೆ ಈ ಸಪ್ಲಿಮೆಂಟರಿ ಎಸ್ವಿಮೇಟ್ ಬರುತ್ತಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಹಿಂದೆ 27 ಕೋಟಿ ಇನ್ ವೆಸ್ಟ್ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದನ್ನು ಕಡಮೆ ಮಾಡಿ 16 ಕೋಟಿಗೆ ಮಿತಿಗೊಳಿಸಿದ್ದರೆ ಈಗ ಈ ಸಪ್ಲಿಮೆಂಟರಿ ಗ್ರಾಂಟನ್ನು ಕೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ದಿವಸ ವಿಧಾನ ಸೌಧ ಕಟ್ಟಲು ಪ್ರಾರಂಭವಾಗಿ ಎರಡು ವರ್ಷಗಳಾದ ಮೇಲೆ ಅದು ತಪ್ಪೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದು ಸರಿಯೆ ? ಹಿಂದೆಕೆ ಹೇಳದೆ ಸುಮ್ಮನಿದ್ದಿರಿ ? ಹಿಂದೆ ನಾವು ಇದನ್ನು ಖಂಡಿಸಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಕೊನೆಗೆ ಈ ದಿವಸ ವಾದರೂ ನಾವು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದನ್ನು ಸಮರ್ಥಿಸಲು ಮುಂದೆ ಬಂದರಲ್ಲಾ !

MR. SPEAKER.—This refers to which demand, may I know ?

(Laughter).

Sri B. HUTCHE GOWDA.—I am opposing all the demands, Sir. ಎದ್ದು ಜೈಕ್ಲಿ ಇಲಾಖೆಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಹಾಗೆ ಎಲೆಕ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ ಫ್ಯಾಕ್ಟರಿಯಲ್ಲಿ 1,200 ಕೆಲಸಗಾರರಿದ್ದರು. ಅವರನ್ನು ಕಡಮೆಮಾಡಿ 950 ಕ್ಕೆ ಇಳಿಸಿದರು.

MR. SPEAKER.—Which is the demand you are now referring to ?

Sri B. HUTCHE GOWDA.—The Chief Minister referred to the labour dispute in the Electric Factory.

ಡಿಮ್ಯಾಂಡ್ ನಂಬರು 26ರ ವಿಚಾರ ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿರುವುದು. 1950 ನೆಯ ಜುಲೈನಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಅಗ್ರಿಮೆಂಟ್ ಆಯಿತು. ಅದು ತೃಪ್ತಿಕರವಾಗಿದ್ದು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಅದರ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ನಡೆದು ಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದರೆ ಈಗ ಅವರು ಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆ ಹೋಗಬೇಕಾಗಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ.

Sri H. SIDDHAVEERAPPA (Minister for Home and Industries)—Sir, I am extremely sorry. ಅಗ್ರಿಮೆಂಟ್ ನೋಡಿ ವಿಷಯ ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಈ ಭಾಷಣಗಳಿಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಎಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಹುಚ್ಚೇಗೌಡ.—ಕೆಲಸಗಾರರನ್ನು ಕಡಮೆ ಮಾಡಿದರು, ದಿನಕ್ಕೆ 2-3 ಆಣೆ ಪಾಸ್ತಿ ಕೊಡದೇ ಹೋದರು; ತಿಂಗಳಿಗೆ 3 ರೂಪಾಯಿ 40 ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಬರುವವರಿಗೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನಬೇಕು, 80 ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಬರುವವರಿಗೆ 4 ರೂಪಾಯಿ, ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಮೇಲ್ಪಟ್ಟು ಬರುವವರಿಗೆ 6 ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಮಾಡಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಈಗ ಕೋಟಿಗೆ ಹೋದ ಮೇಲೆ ಈ ದಿವಸ ಬಡ್ಡೆಟ್ ಡಿಮ್ಯಾಂಡ್ ತಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ 84 ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳ ಬಂಡವಾಳ ಹಾಕಿ ವರ್ಷಕ್ಕೆ 3½ ಲಕ್ಷ ಉತ್ಪತ್ತಿ ಸೋಲಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಡೈಯಿಂಗ್ ಮೆಷೀನ್ ಇದೆ, ಅದು ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದರಿಂದ ಲಕ್ಷಾಂತರ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳ ನಷ್ಟ. ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಟ್ರಾನ್ಸ್‌ಫಾರ್ಮರ್, ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಇವೆಲ್ಲಾ ಮಾಡಲು ಸವಲತ್ತಿದೆ. ಇಂಡಿಯಾ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೂಡ ಇಂಥ ಮೆಷೀನ್ ಎಲ್ಲೂ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುವ 950 ಜನರಿಗೆ ನಂಬಳ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಕೊಡದಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಇದು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಕೆಲಸಮಾಡುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಹೋದ ವರ್ಷವೇ ಈ ವಿಚಾರ ಹೇಳಿದೆ. ಆರು ತಿಂಗಳು ಜನರಲ್ ಮ್ಯಾನೇಜರನ್ನು ನೇಮಿಸಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಹೀಗಿರುವಾಗ ಡಿಮ್ಯಾಂಡಿಗೆ ಹೇಗೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಗೆ ಕೊಡುವುದು? ಹೀಗೆ ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಎರೋಧಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆಂದರೆ ಏನು ಮಾಡುವುದು?

ಆ ಮೇಲೆ ವರ್ಷೇ ವರ್ಷೇ ವಿದ್ಯುಚ್ಛಕ್ತಿಗೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ನಾರ್ತ್‌ವುಡ್ ವರ್ಷಗಳಿಂದ ಬಂಡವಾಳ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿ ಹಾಕಿದ್ದರು. ಈಗ ಒಟ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಉತ್ಪತ್ತಿ ವರ್ಷಕ್ಕೆ 7 ಲಕ್ಷ ಕಡಮೆಯಾಗುತ್ತಿದೆ. 1952-53 ರಲ್ಲಿ 89 ಲಕ್ಷ ಮತ್ತು 1953-54 ರಲ್ಲಿ 83 ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳು ಉತ್ಪತ್ತಿಯಾಗಿ 1954-55 ರಲ್ಲಿ 75 ಲಕ್ಷಕ್ಕೆ ಇಳಿದಿದೆ. ಉತ್ಪತ್ತಿ ಹಿಂದೆ ಇದ್ದಷ್ಟಾದರೂ ಇರದೆ ಇನ್ನೂ ಕಡಮೆಯಾಗಿದೆ. 12 ಕೋಟಿ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳ ಬಂಡವಾಳ ಕಳೆದ ಆರು ವರ್ಷಗಳಿಗೆ ಹಾಕಿರುವಾಗ ಪುನಃ ಅಡಿಪನ್ನರಾಗಿ ಇಷ್ಟು ಕೊಡಿ ಎಂದು ಈಗ ಕೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

ವಿದ್ಯಾಭ್ಯಾಸದ ಬಾಬನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡರೆ ವರ್ಷಕ್ಕೆ 50 ಸ್ಕೂಲನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಒಂದೊಂದು ಕಡೆಗೆ ಒಂದೊಂದು ಪ್ರೈಮರಿ ಸ್ಕೂಲು ಒಂದು ಮಿಡ್ಲ್ ಸ್ಕೂಲು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದು ಎಷ್ಟು ಮಾತ್ರವೂ ಸಾಲದು. ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದಿಂದ ಬರುವ ಗ್ರಾಂಟನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡರೆ ಅದು ಮೂರು ವರ್ಷಗಳಾದ ಮೇಲೆ ನಿಂತುಹೋಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆ ಮೇಲೆ ನಾವೇ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಖರ್ಚನ್ನೂ ವಹಿಸಬೇಕು. ಇದಕ್ಕೇನು ಪರಿಹಾರವಿದೆ ಯೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿಲ್ಲ. ಹೀಗಾದರೆ ಒತ್ತಾಯ ಶಿಕ್ಷಣ ಯೋಜನೆಯನ್ನು ಜಾರಿಗೆ ತರಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗುತ್ತದೆಯೇ? ಇದನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಹೇಳದಿರುವಾಗ ಈ ಅಡಿಪನ್ನರ್ ಗ್ರಾಂಟಿಗೆ ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ಒಪ್ಪಿಗೆಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು.

ಯಾವ ಸರ್ಕಾರವೇ ಆಗಲಿ ಇಂಥ ಡಿಮ್ಯಾಂಡ್ ಒಂದನ್ನು ಸಭೆಯ ಒಪ್ಪಿಗೆಗೆ ಇಡುವಾಗ ಅದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಒಂದು ನಿಶ್ಚಿತ, ನಿಯಮ ಪಾಲಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಬರುವಂತಿರಬೇಕು. ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಉಳಿತಾಯವಾಗುವ ಹಾಗೆ

ಬಡ್ಡೆಟ್ ತಯಾರಾಗಿರಬೇಕು. ಈ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ತಜ್ಞ ರೊಬ್ಬರು ತಿಳಿಸಿರುವುದನ್ನು ಸಭೆಯ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತರುತ್ತೇನೆ :—

“This canon simply insists on the evidence of deficits in public expenditure. It is safe and sometimes even necessary to have moderate surplus. The main thing, however, is to have a balanced budget. Stable public finance consists in making both ends meet. Continued infringement of this canon leads to financial confusion and ultimately to ruin and revolution.”

ಜನವರಿ ತಿಂಗಳಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಮೂರು ಕೋಟಿ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳ ಬಡ್ಡೆಟ್ ಮಂಜೂರಾಗಿದೆ. ಈಗ ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದೆ ಇರುವ ಬಡ್ಡೆಟ್ ಖೋತಾಬಡ್ಡೆಟ್ ಆಗಿದೆ. ಹೀಗಿರುವಲ್ಲಿ ಇನ್ನೂ ಡಿಮ್ಯಾಂಡನ್ನು ಸಭೆಯ ಮಂಜೂರಾತಿಗಾಗಿ ಇಡುವುದು ಎಂದರೆ ಇದರಿಂದ ಮುಂದೆ ನಮ್ಮ ದೇಶದ ಪರಿಣಾಮ ಏನಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಯೋಚಿಸಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಇದೇ ರೀತಿ ವಿದ್ಯಾ ಸುಧಾರಣೆಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ವಿಪರೀತವಾಗಿ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಖರ್ಚುಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಉದ್ದೇಶಿಸಿದೆ. ಯಾವುದೇ ಅತ್ಯಗತ್ಯವೋ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ಖರ್ಚುಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಇಂಥ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಬರೀ ಅಸಂಭವ ಬಹುಮತಾಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನೇ ಗಣನೆಗೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬಾರದು. ದೇಶದ ಜನರ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಕ್ಕೆ ತಕ್ಕಂತೆ ಹೋಗಬೇಕು. ಹಣದ ಅಭಾವ ಬಹಳವಾಗಿರುವಾಗ, ಖೋತಾ ಬಡ್ಡೆಟ್ಟಿನ ಆಧಾರದಮೇಲೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಆಡಳಿತ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿರುವಾಗ, ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಮಿತವ್ಯಯದ ಕಡೆಗೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿ ಗಮನಕೊಡಬೇಕು. ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾದ ಮಟ್ಟಿಗೂ ಉಳಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನಪಡಬೇಕು.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಈಗಿರತಕ್ಕ ಡಿಮ್ಯಾಂಡಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ಖೋತಾ ಮಾಡಬಹುದೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಹುಚ್ಚೇಗೌಡ.—ಬಡ್ಡೆಟ್ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ರಚಿತವಾಗಿದ್ದರೆ ಈ ಡಿಮ್ಯಾಂಡಿಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶವೇ ಇರುತ್ತಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಉದಾಹರಣೆಗೆ, ಕಮ್ಯುನಿಟಿ ಪ್ರಾಜೆಕ್ಟ್ ವಿಚಾರ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಿ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—It was pointed out under that demand that this sanction was accorded either in January or February or March. So you cannot think of these supplementary demands before January. This has been pointed out; but still you are insisting upon it and you are taking away much of your valuable time.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಹುಚ್ಚೇಗೌಡ.—ಅದನ್ನು ನಾನು ಒಪ್ಪಿ ಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈಗ ಕೆಲವು ಬಾಬುಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನಿಬ್ಬಂದಿ ಖರ್ಚು ವಿಪರೀತವಾಗಿದ್ದು ಆ ಬಾಬಿನ ಖರ್ಚಿಗೆ ಬಹಳ ಕಡಮೆ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಬದಗಿಸಿದೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ತಾವು ಯಾವ ಡಿಮ್ಯಾಂಡಿನ ವಿಚಾರ ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದೀರಿ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ತಿಳಿಸಬೇಕು. That is what I have been insisting from the beginning.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಹುಚ್ಚೇಗೌಡ.—ಇನ್ನು unproductive works ಮೇಲೆ—Demand No. 40—ದಾಖಲನ್ನು ಸಾಲಮಾಡಿ ಹಾಕಬಾರದು. Productive works ಕಡೆಗೇ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ನಿಗಾ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು.

Mr. SPEAKER.—If you do not like to have any reply, you can go on.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—I do not think any new point has been made for me to reply.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—I want to give some figures which I promised.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—But they must be relevant.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—Yes. It is about nation building activities.

Mr. SPEAKER.—But they may raise a point of order while this Bill is under discussion. After this is over, you may.....

Sri B. HUTCHE GOWDA.—It is up to me to raise any point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER.—You may do it. You have a right to do it.

The question is :

“That the Mysore Appropriation (No. 3) Bill, 1954, be taken into consideration.”

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Clauses 2 and 3. The question is :

“That Clauses 2 and 3 stand part of the Bill.”

The motion was adopted.

Clauses 2 and 3 were added to the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Schedule. The question is :

“That the Schedule stand part of the Bill.”

The motion was adopted.

The Schedule was added to the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Clause 1. The question is :

“That Clause 1 stand part of the Bill.”

The motion was adopted.

Clause 1 was added to the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Title and Preamble. The question is :

“That the Title and the Preamble stand part of the Bill.”

The motion was adopted.

The Title and the Preamble were added to the Bill.

Motion to pass.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—Sir, I beg to move :

“That the Mysore Appropriation (No. 3) Bill, 1954, be passed.”

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

“That the Mysore Appropriation (No. 3) Bill, 1954, be passed.”

The motion was adopted.

*Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—I had promised to give information about the expenditure incurred for nation building activities during the previous regime and in the regime after the Congress took up office in the year 1947-48.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—I rise to a point of order. Are we discussing anything about the previous regime and the present regime?

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—No, no. Comparative figures you wanted.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—Unless it

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—That itself is an indication that they do not want these things to be quoted.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—The Chief Minister's Explanatory Memorandum contains all this.

Mr. SPEAKER.—It is usual for the Minister to give this information. But the Hon'ble Member has taken the extraordinary step of giving information for the benefit of the House. He has a desire to give the information.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—The Minister has already given the information in the budget itself.

Sri B. HUTCHE GOWDA.—Will the Member give any information about additional taxation ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—You will hear him.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—In October 1947 the Congress Government took up office. The Budget was prepared by the previous Government. The expenditure then for nation building activities was Rs. 485 lakhs. Now, today, the expenditure for nation building activities is 10 crores and 88 lakhs.

In	1947-48	it was	485.4	lakhs.
	1948-49		690.4	„
	1950-51		824.8	„
	1951-52		855.2	„
	1952-53		853.5	„
	1953-54		895.1	„
	1954-55		1088.0	„

Similarly I could give figures relating to capital expenditure not met from revenues. But I do not want to quote.

I would simply say: it was 397 lakhs then and now it is 772 lakhs. So, just as the deficit has gone on increasing, the expenditure on nation building activities has doubled itself. It is all that I wanted to point out.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The leader of the Opposition Sri Imam, while he was making a lengthy speech on the first Appropriation Bill today has admitted that increased grants under nation building activities have been given.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—I admit that

Mr. SPEAKER.—That is sufficient. Now the House will rise for the day and meet tomorrow at 12 noon.

The House adjourned at Five of the Clock to meet again at Twelve of the Clock on Wednesday, the 31st March 1954.
